

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9925

fishery jurisdiction and the Executive has consistently protested such actions. The U.S. Government has not recognized any of these attempts to drive our fishing vessels off the high seas. It is interesting to note that many of these nations, including Canada, which wish to force our vessels off of rich fishing grounds, export to the United States substantial quantities of the very fish our fishermen are not permitted to harvest.

In the first session of this Congress, the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. Pelly] introduced a bill, H.R. 7815, which would place an embargo on fishery products from countries that harass American fishermen operating in waters which the United States considers the high seas. If this measure is enacted all coastal nations would clearly understand that the United States will not docilely accept interference with our legal fishing activities by nations, which through unilateral acts, seek to drive our fleets from the high seas.

I am in complete agreement with the provisions of Mr. Pelly's measure. I believe that every Member of this House should be concerned about the actions taken by some nations which will result in a decline of this country's position as one of the world's leading fishery nations. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will hold hearings on H.R. 7815 in the very near future.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(Mr. FARBSTAIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening many members of the Senate and House were present at the closing dinner celebrating the 10th anniversary of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

On that occasion we heard addresses by His Excellency Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel; Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania; the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Representative Thomas E. Morgan; and by the chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Rochester, N.Y.

As the conference came to a close, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent this message to the committee:

Please extend to your membership and to the Members of Congress present this evening my warm wishes on the 10th anniversary of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

Your work has helped in bringing about better relationships in the world community. You have also been forceful proponents of a worldwide effort to reach the roots of human poverty and social unrest through a sound program of foreign assistance. These efforts, as well as your role in achieving better understanding between the United States and Israel, deserve our gratitude and will surely bear further fruit in the coming decade.

Dr. MORGAN delivered a most significant statement at the dinner on the con-

structive role that Congress can play in the determination of our foreign policy and on the importance of our foreign assistance program—and on the need to write conditions in that program in order to make certain that our economic aid truly serves the cause of peace. Dr. MORGAN's speech was impressive and I would like to share it with the Members of this body. I am, therefore, inserting it into the Record:

SPEECH BY HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, TO BE DELIVERED AT THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 4, 1964

I note that this is the 10th anniversary of your committee. I am glad to join in this celebration, for the year of 1964 is an anniversary for me, too.

It marks my 20th anniversary in Congress. I was first elected in 1944. In 1946, I was privileged to become a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The committee meets in an ancient room, more than a century old, whose thick walls and high ceiling have echoed, over the generations, many words of debate about foreign policy. Much of American history has been written on the huge oval table which dominates this Chamber.

The history of many other countries has also been written in this room. For America has played a constructive role helping many peoples around the world into freedom. We have raised their aspirations and we have equipped them with the resources to help break the chains of military, colonial, and economic servitudes.

And in this Foreign Affairs Committee room, we have helped to write a little of the contemporary history of the Jewish people. From this vantage point, we have been able to watch with deep sympathy the struggle of the Jewish people to establish the State of Israel, and the unfinished struggle to win peace for its people.

We in Congress were more than spectators. We were fortunate to have a part in this historic undertaking. For Congress does have a good deal to say and to do about foreign policy. It is true that the foreign policy of our Nation is conducted by the executive branch. It is so provided in our Constitution. But foreign policy is more than bilateral diplomatic exchange between ambassadors and Secretaries of State. Foreign policy is a complex of relations, having to do with trade, alliances, foreign assistance, conventions, and treaties. Many of these issues are resolved by legislation. Congress has a continuing role to play, laying down the rules, voting appropriations and articulating policies which reflect the views of the American people.

In addition to that, it is the task of Congress to initiate programs, in order to strengthen the prestige, influence and power of our country in the conduct of our foreign policy.

Sometimes, Congress can and should anticipate—speak and act in advance of the executive branch, which may be diffident because of the restraints imposed by diplomacy. Sometimes it is necessary to reassure the Executive and to put the world on notice that a given policy will have the support of the American people. The story of Israel is an apt example.

I believe that congressional support for restoration of the State of Israel reflected the judgment of the American people. Here, as in other chapters of our history, the people were moved by moral conviction. And they were ahead of the diplomats, who are traditionally and understandably inhibited by the cross purposes of convenience.

So it was in December 1945, a few months

after the war ended, that both Houses adopted a resolution favoring the opening of Palestine to Jewish immigration and the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home.

Now we all know that the mere adoption of a resolution by Congress does not automatically change the course of history. When the State of Israel was established and swiftly recognized in 1948, it was due to an aroused public opinion, brilliant diplomacy by inspired Jewish leadership, and countless acts of dauntless heroism by valiant, young Israelis-to-be.

Israel's problems came before our House Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1951. In its first 3 years, Israel had opened its doors to the survivors of Hitler's terror and had absorbed almost 600,000 refugees. But the people of Israel, eager to provide sanctuary for every Jew in need, could not carry the burden by themselves. In 1951, Israel formally requested inclusion in our foreign aid program. Here, once again, was a situation where public opinion had to override diplomatic caution. Many Members of Congress joined in sponsoring bills authorizing a grant to Israel. The testimony that was presented to our committee was eloquent. Moreover, it was pointed out to us that as Israel absorbed these refugees, it was actually relieving the United States of a major share of the cost of maintaining them in the displaced persons camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy.

There was some opposition from those who feared that if we helped Israel, the Arab States which had not requested our aid would accuse us of partisanship.

But the proposed legislation did include a \$50 million grant for the Arab refugees displaced by the Arab war against Israel in 1948. Our committee felt that it was equitable to provide a similar amount for the Jewish refugees.

This was the beginning of U.S. grant aid to Israel.

There was pessimistic prophecy that Israel could not survive because of the terrible handicaps and obstacles it faced. It was devoid of resources. It was overwhelmed by refugees who lacked good health, skill, and productivity. It was besieged on all sides by enemies refusing to make peace. Such a state, it was gloomily predicted, would soon be eroded into bankruptcy by economic attrition and Arab blockade, if it were not, in fact, liquidated by military attack.

In retrospect, United States aid to Israel has proved to be a spectacular success story. Over the years, our aid has been generous but few have begrudged it. The program is invariably cited as a demonstration that foreign aid can be very effective if the people know how to use it, if they have a competent government moved by a sense of national purpose and a high appreciation of the overriding need to deal justly with all the people of the country.

Over the years, the Arab States have also come to value U.S. aid and they, too, have benefited by it. There was a time when critics would argue that aid to Israel on a per capita basis far exceeded aid to the Arabs. That kind of invidious comparison was never valid because aid must be allocated not on a per capita basis but on the basis of the recipient government's capacity to absorb it effectively.

The United States has given generous aid to the Arab League States even though they are in a state of war against Israel. At the same time, however, we have registered our opposition to that war. Our committee has made it clear that we do not wish to become implicated as an accessory.

In 1960, we believed the United Nations and our Department of State had failed to act strongly to halt the illegal blockade of the Suez Canal. An amendment to the foreign aid bill was adopted, declaring that

the purposes of foreign aid are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance from us wage economic warfare against other nations we assist. We condemned boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

That amendment was approved in the House. It was attacked, but it won approval in the Senate where it was supported by both the late President Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In 1961, Congress wrote into the foreign aid bill a statement recognizing the right of all private persons to travel and to pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion, an allusion to the refusal of Arab countries to admit American Jews.

It is not necessary for me to recount here the events which have resulted in all the nations of the Middle East being caught up in a spiraling arms race. Massive military aid by the Soviet Union to some of the Arab countries is a matter of concern to the United States as well as to Israel and all other peace-loving countries and it has forced Israel to devote much of her resources to a buildup of defensive strength.

Many Members of Congress have raised a logical question. Is it right to extend economic aid which enables a country to free other resources for the purchase of Soviet equipment designed for the purpose of waging war against one of our friends and allies?

We are often told that we should not be disturbed by this situation—that our aid is economic and that when we furnish economic aid, such as surplus foods, we are not thereby contributing to an arms race. I have never been impressed by this argument. On the Hill, we like to keep our bookkeeping simple. There is no real difference between economic and military aid. They complement each other. It is less than frank to pretend that our economic aid does not bolster the military prowess of the recipient country. That is why, parenthetically, so many of us in Congress feel that it is wrong to separate military and economic aid. Both must serve the overriding purpose—the national interest of the United States. Accordingly, we have some misgivings about economic aid to a nation which shops in Moscow for arms. Many Members became alarmed over a situation in which we have been, however, unwittingly, subsidizing a wasteful and dangerous arms race.

This audience does not need a review of Israel's dynamic growth. As a result of her progress, aid to Israel is declining, although Israel will continue to receive surplus foods and some loans.

But let me assure you that we will watch this program carefully for we will not wish to terminate a successful program prematurely. Nor will we cut aid to Israel if it endangers Israel's existence or encourages those who threaten it. It is to our own interest to help Israel preserve her freedom and independence.

For we are fully aware that Israel's needs for aid reflect the unfortunate fact that Israel must divert so much of its resources for security, because of the continued animosity of her neighbors and the concentration of Soviet weapons on her frontiers.

In this situation, there are two possible alternatives; either halt the arms race or act firmly to prevent an arms imbalance.

Last year, Congress tried the first alternative. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs proposed an amendment to the foreign aid bill which bars assistance to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or any country receiving assistance from us. Congressman FARBER, the author of that amendment, is present here tonight.

This amendment was approved in the House. Despite some opposition a very large majority of the Senate agreed to the language as we wrote it. The legislation names no names. It is up to the administration to make the determination as to whether the provision applies to any particular country.

That was alternative 1. If that alternative cannot be carried out, then manifestly, the administration should consider the second alternative—make certain that Israel has the arms to defend herself.

Of course, the real solution is a peace settlement. But this can be obtained only by negotiations, and regrettably the Arab States still refuse to meet with Israel. Some day—we hope soon—they will reverse their position and recognize Israel—in the best interests of all the peoples of the Near East.

Some people have criticized us because we write conditions into our foreign aid program. We believe that the conditions that we have written into the law should strengthen rather than weaken the hands of the administration in seeking to attain our foreign policy objectives. The United States has the right to be discriminating in the allocation of our assistance. We are under no obligation to extend aid to countries which threaten the peace, which deprive their people of freedom, and which weaken the free world.

I believe that Congress supports foreign aid primarily because it is in the national interest. Foreign aid helps to strengthen the United States. It helps to strengthen other nations which are allied with us in the defense of principles in which we believe. Aid must be consistent with our own security. And it must also be faithful to our ideals.

The defense of our society rests in the first instance on the depth and abiding loyalty of every American to freedom. Without that faith, our morale is weakened. Without that conviction, our alliances are undermined.

It may sound trite and old fashioned to say it, but morality continues to govern our relations with each other—whether they be the relations of each American with his neighbor, whether they be the relations of our Nation with other nations.

And so we in Congress must continue to crystallize our views, define our objectives, and raise our voices about what we think is right and what we think is wrong.

The Record shows clearly that Congress has never hesitated to take the initiative on foreign policy issues in the past. I believe that it will continue to take the initiative whenever the peace is threatened.

PERSECUTION OF PERSONS IN SOVIET UNION BECAUSE OF RELIGION

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I introduced a resolution which proposes to express the sense of the House that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders. Response from my colleagues was extremely gratifying and many joined me in introduction of identical or similar resolutions, all of which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In accordance with standard procedure, the committee asked the Department of State for its comments,

and a reply was received a short time ago.

In its report, the Department of State recognized the humanitarian and religious motives which inspired the resolutions, but expressed the view that inasmuch as Soviet officials have previously reacted most unfavorably to outside criticism of its internal interests, particularly by foreign government organs or official representatives, the adoption of such resolution might have an adverse effect on the present situation.

While recommending against adoption of the resolution, the Department gave its opinion as follows:

All things considered, the Department believes that appeals by private organizations and individuals to the Soviet authorities is the procedure most likely to bring about a change in Soviet policies affecting the situation of Soviet Jews. Such appeals may heighten Soviet sensitivity on this subject and may encourage a decrease in Soviet activity against these unfortunate people.

Since the fate of Soviet Jewry is of concern to the world community, serious thought might be given to a united appeal of private organizations representing worldwide Jewry and, if possible, other religious groups.

My purpose in reading these paragraphs into the Record is to bring these comments to the attention of the various national Jewish organizations for their consideration and possible action in behalf of this cause. It may well be such organizations would also entertain the idea of inaugurating a campaign to enlist the support and initiation of appeals from similar organizations in other countries, as well as organized groups of other religious faiths.

AMENDMENT TO LAND-WATER CONSERVATION BILL

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I presented to the Rules Committee an amendment which I will propose to the land and water conservation fund bill (H.R. 3846) when it reaches the floor of the House. I hope and believe that my amendment will give the private forest industry the assurance it seeks in connection with land acquisition under this bill and will permit that industry to lend its support to the enactment of H.R. 3846.

For the information of other Members interested in this matter, I am inserting at this point the statement explaining the amendment which I delivered to the Rules Committee this morning:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY ON H.R. 3846 BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, MAY 6, 1964

1. Chairman ASPINALL was courteous enough to notify me when he set hearings last year on H.R. 3846.

2. I felt that the bill was in competent hands and we have not, until very recently, taken any notice of, or action with respect to, the bill, as a committee.

3. I did not then—and I do not now—raise any question as to jurisdiction. The bill was properly referred to, and belongs in, his committee.

4. About 4 weeks ago a group of North Carolina lumbermen came to see me on